

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action dated December 3, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully considered. Claims 1-14 and 16-18 are pending. Claims 1-5, 12 and 13 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 6-11, 14 and 16-18 have been rejected. Claims 6, 14, 17 and 18 have been amended. Claim 16 has been cancelled.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Stein* (U.S. Patent No. 5,963,872). Without conceding the propriety of the rejection independent claim 16 has been cancelled.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 6-11, 14 and 17-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Stein* (U.S. Patent No. 5,963,872). Without conceding the propriety of the rejection independent claims 6, 14 and 17 have been amended. It is respectfully submitted that *Stein* does not teach, *inter alia*, an apparatus for adding functionality to a portable electronic device comprising “a housing...a housing port of a portable electronic device... a hardware interface connector... a hardware interface port... and a securing means for securing said portable electronic device to said housing” as recited in claim 1 and similarly in claims 14 and 17.

Stein discloses an electronic equipment audio system having a modular unit 131 as shown for instance in FIG. 15. The modular unit 131 may be inserted into an opening 373 of a car stereo 250. However, *Stein* lacks a teaching of a securing means for securing the portable electronic device to the housing as recited in claims 6, 14 and 17. Additionally, *Stein* fails to teach the structural features of the hardware interface port layout and the hardware interface connector receptacle layout as recited in claims 6, 14, and 18.

In accordance with the M.P.E.P. §2143.03, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re: Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re: Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494 196 (CCPA 1970). Therefore, since the prior art lacks all the claimed features, *Stein* cannot be said to teach or suggest the present invention as claimed. Hence, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 7-11 depend from independent claim 6 and are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as is claim 6.

Claim 18 depends from independent claim 17 and is patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as is claim 17.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If it is believed that the application is not in condition for allowance the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney if it is believed that such contact will expedite the prosecution of the application.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, Applicants petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2036.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP



Marc W. Butler
Reg. No. 50,219

Date: March 3, 2005
Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-5304
Telephone: 202-861-1500
Facsimile: 202-861-1783